WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated:- 04.04.2006

Coram:-

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice P.SATHASIVAM
and
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice J.A.K.SAMPATHKUMAR

Habeas Corpus Petition No.60 of 2006

Jagadeesh ... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
rep. by its Secretary to Government,
Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Collector and District
Magistrate,Tiruvallur District,
Tiruvallur. ... Respondents

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a Writ of Habeas Corpus to call for the entire records leading to the detention of petitioner by name Jagadeesh, son of Ranjit Singh under Act 14/82 vide detention order dated 26.09.2005 on the file of the 2nd respondent herein, made in proceedings BDFGISV No.23/2005 and set aside the same and direct the second respondent herein to produce the body now confined in Central Prison, Chennai, before this Court and thereafter set him at liberty.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.N.Balakrishnan
For Respondents: Mr.Abudhukumar Rajarathinam
Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by P.SATHASIVAM, J.)

The petitioner by name Jagadeesh, who was detained as a "Goonda" as contemplated under the Tamil Nadu Prevention of Dangerous Activities of Bootleggers, Drug Offenders, Forest Offenders, Goondas, Immoral Traffic Offenders, Slum Grabbers and Video Pirates Act, 1982 (Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982), by the impugned detention order dated 26.09.2005, challenges the same in this Petition.

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

WEB COPY

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Government Advocate for the respondents.

3. At the foremost, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is enormous delay in disposal of the representation of the detenu, which vitiates the ultimate order of detention. With reference to the above claim, learned Government Advocate has placed the details, which show that the representation of the detenu dated 31.12.2005 was received by the Government on 02.01.2006 and remarks were called for on 03.01.2006. Thereafter, the remarks were received by the Government on 10.01.2006 and the File was submitted on 12.01.2006 and the same was dealt with by the Under Secretary and the Deputy Secretary on the same date i.e. on 12.01.2006 and finally, the Minister for Prohibition and Excise passed orders on 13.01.2006. The rejection letter was prepared on 30.01.2006 and the same was sent to the detenu on the same date i.e., on 30.01.2006 and served to him on 04.02.2006. As rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner, though the Minister for Prohibition and Excise passed an order on 13.01.2006, there is no explanation at all for taking time for preparation of rejection letter till 30.01.2006. In the absence of any explanation by the person concerned even after excluding the intervening holidays, we are of the view that the time taken for preparation of rejection letter is on the higher side and we hold that the said delay has prejudiced the detenu in disposal of his representation. On this ground, we quash the impugned order of detention.

4. Accordingly, the Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the impugned order of detention is set aside. The detenu is directed to be set at liberty forthwith from the custody unless he is required in some other case or cause.

raa

Sd/
Asst.Registrar

/true copy/

Sub Asst.Registrar

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

WEB COPY

To

1. The Secretary, State of Tamil Nadu,Prohibition and Excise Department, Fort St. George, Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Collector and District Magistrate, Tiruvallur District, Tiruvallur.

3. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Chennai.

4. The Joint Secretary to Government, Public (Law and Order) Fort St. George, Chennai-9.

5. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.

+ 1 cc to Mr.M.N. Balakrishnan, Advocate SR No.17067

HCP. No.60 of 2006

VS(CO)
SR/18.4.2006

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/